

THE DEMOCRAT AND THE NEBRASKA BILL.

We made a brief allusion last week to the fact that the Democrat had broken its ominous silence on the Nebraska question, and come out in favor of the measure. This is no more than we expected. The Democrat, no longer ago than 1849, was hot in its advocacy of the principles of free soil—a fast and furious friend of the "Wilmot Proviso." But when the spurs of the party leaders were struck into its sides, and it felt their roweling, it backed away and ingloriously yielded. With the remembrance of this, we were not surprised to find it again linked with oppression, and making a mock of democratic ideas, and warring with the principles of freedom.—The Democrat now says, in breaking silence: "We heartily concur in the principles of Congressional non-intervention, and territorial sovereignty as embodied in the Compromise measures of 1850, and as set forth in the speech of Senator Douglas, and will give our support to any bill which will effectually carry them into execution."

It quotes from Mr. Douglas, as a leading feature of the Compromise of 1850, "that the people of the territories were to be allowed to do as they pleased upon the subject of Slavery, subject only to the provisions of the Constitution of the United States." Ignoring the Missouri Compromise line, the Democrat says:

"The leaving to the people of every territory the unrestricted right to legislate upon their own domestic affairs, is certainly more consonant to the spirit of republicanism, besides tending to promote the tranquility of the country."

Now the Democrat does know, or it should, that this principle of non-intervention established by the Compromise of 1850 had reference only to the territories acquired from Mexico, and no one ever dreamed that it had any reference to the territory which had been consecrated to Freedom by the Missouri Compromise. Mr. Douglas himself at Chicago in 1850, when pressing upon the attention of his fellow citizens the merits of the Compromise measures, distinctly said that the principle made no wider application than to the territories of Utah and New Mexico, and did not touch the Missouri Compromise. Mark his language: "I am prepared to stand or fall by the American Union, clinging with the tenacity of life to all its glorious memories of the past, and the precious hopes of the future, and among the memories of the past, I pronounce the Missouri Compromise of 1820 to be one."

The Compromise of 1850 themselves flout the idea that the Compromise of 1820 were abrogated, because in the act relating to the boundary of Texas, one of the Compromise acts, an amendment was inserted on motion of Mr. Mason of Virginia that recognized the validity of the Missouri Act prohibiting Slavery North of 36° 30'. No one of the Committee of 13, who framed the Compromise acts, ever said that they had a wider application than the territories of Utah and Mexico, or that they abrogated the Missouri Compromise.

The several acts of Congress embraced in this series of measures were five in number.

1. An act proposing to the State of Texas the establishment of her northern and western boundaries, the relinquishment by the said State of all territory claimed by her exterior to said boundaries, and of all her claim upon the United States, and to establish a Territorial Government for New Mexico.—[Sept. 9, 1850.] In the fifth clause of the first section of said act is the following proviso, introduced on the motion of Mr. Mason of Virginia, viz:

"Provided, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to impair or qualify any thing contained in the third article of the second section of the 'joint resolution for annexing Texas to the United States,' approved March 1, 1845, either as regards the number of States that may hereafter be formed out of the State of Texas or otherwise."

In the second section, establishing the Territory of New Mexico, is the following proviso:

"And provided, further, That when admitted as a State, the said Territory, or any portion of the same, shall be received into the Union, with or without slavery, as their Constitution may prescribe."

2. An act to establish a Territorial Government for Utah.—[Sept. 9, 1850.] This act contains the same provision in regard to slavery as the preceding.

3. An Act for the admission of the State of California. (This has no reference whatever to slavery; the Constitution of the State, however, prohibited it.)

4. An act to amend and supplementary to an act entitled "An act respecting fugitives from justice and persons escaping from the service of their masters," approved February 12, 1793.—[Sept. 18, 1850.]

5. An act to suppress the slave trade in the District of Columbia.—[Sept. 20, 1850.] These five acts constitute what we called the compromise measures of 1850. They remove the Missouri compromise in regard to the territory north of 36° 30'; agree to admit New Mexico and Utah as States when prepared, with or without slavery, as the people thereof may determine in their respective State Constitutions; admit California with her Constitution as presented, prohibiting slavery within the State; abolish the slave trade within the District of Columbia; and enact more stringent measures for the recovery of fugitive slaves.

When these measures were passed it was supposed that the agitating question of slavery was settled forever, or at least until new acquisitions were made from adjoining territories. The vast territory north of 36° 30' had been dedicated to freedom by solemn enactment, and although the Democrats say that "Mr. Douglas cites instances in which the legislation of Congress has ignored the existence of that line as a boundary line between slavery and freedom," the validity of that compact was religiously observed.—Does the Democrat suppose, because Congress rejected a proposition in 1848 to extend the Missouri line of 36° 30' to the Pacific, so as to cut California into two States,

that the principle of the Missouri line was ignored? This is the main case cited by Mr. Douglas; but the reply to that is, that every inch of territory acquired from Mexico (and California was a portion of that acquisition) was free territory. What made the Compromise measures of 1850 so odious to some was that they changed the condition of the territory, from one of freedom, to possible slavery. The idea that the principles involved in the Compromise of 1850, abrogated the Missouri Compromise of 1820, is a new one, yet scarcely three months old,—new even to Mr. Douglas, for only the year before, on the morning of the 4th of March 1853, he reported a bill for the organization of the territory of Nebraska which contained no provision for the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, or squinted to it, and even made a speech in its favor. It was on this occasion that Mr. Atchison, who favored the bill, said, "It is evident that the Missouri Compromise cannot be repealed."—"It is irremediable."—"We must submit to them," and much more of the same import. This Conspiracy against freedom, which the Democrat "heartily approves," bears date with the opening of the present Congress; and the attempt to force a construction of the compromises of 1850, so as to apply the principles of non-intervention to the territories north of 36° 30' is not a whit older. The North knows full well that neither in not out of Congress were the Compromise measures of 1850, when passed, debated on the ground that they would abrogate the Compromise of 1820. Had its editorial heart a spark of manliness, it would imitate the example of the Age, and scout this disingenuous and hypocritical plea, and if it must be false to freedom, as the Age is not, have the courage to avow it.

As does Mr. Burke of New Hampshire, of the old Guard, that the object of Mr. Douglas' bill is to repeal the Compromise of 1820. To quote Mr. B's words: "The very object and intention of the bill is, that the north and the south shall enjoy equal privileges—that the people of the south may emigrate there with their slaves, as well as the people of the north with their property—and with no other understanding of its operation, could Douglas' bill find a single supporter in the whole South." The territory will be just as free to the slaveholder to emigrate there with his slaves, as to the northern man to go there with his cattle—and no reasonable man can place any other construction upon the operation of Mr. Douglas' bill, with all its provisos and explanations."

There is the bravery of the highway robbery, and the meanness of the midnight assassin, in defending the bill. Mr. Burke chooses the former. Does not the Democrat in advancing this disingenuous plea adopt the latter?

In 1849, the Democrat argued stoutly for the Wilmot Proviso, and the right of Congress to forever establish the condition of freedom in territories free from Slavery. It did right. Now where do we find it? Advocating the right of the people to establish slavery. It copies and "cordially approves" an extract from Douglas, the sentiment, "If they [the people] wish Slavery they have a right to it." "They have a right to legislate upon their own domestic affairs." So they have, but conformable to the laws of God, and these laws give them no right to legalize Slavery, any more than they give them the right to legalize theft, murder, arson, and the like. Slavery may, and does exist by force of custom, usage, and it may be protected, as it is in the Southern States, by force of municipal law; but we deny the right to establish it—if established, as it may be, it is by force, and against the spirit and purposes of republican governments. A democrat, and a resident of the free States, in obedience to party boasts, to curry favor with an administration which has place in its disposal, arguing on week day, that "the people have a right to slavery if they wish," and then going to church on the sabbath and praying "that the bands of the oppressor may be broken." Out upon such democracy. The father of deceit itself is a better democrat, or at least equally as good as the democrat who favors this doctrine and practices in this way. Yet the Democrat, shame on it, declares that the people have the unrestricted right to legislate upon their own domestic affairs, and "if they wish Slavery they have a right to it." Had not the Democrat better advocate the establishment of Slavery here, and open its columns to such advertisements as this, which we cut from the Autauga Citizen, one of our exchanges, published at Prattville, Alabama, March 9th.

NEGRO DOGS.

The undersigned would take this method to inform the public generally, that he has one of the best pack of Negro Dogs to be found in the State. Those who have negroes run away, would do well to test the skill of his dogs. His charges are three dollars per day, or fifteen dollars for each dog. He can always be reached at his residence, seven miles from Prattville.

P. F. DEBARDELLABEN.

Dec. 15, 1853. n16-6m

What a world of blessedness there is in the system,—hunting men with dogs, as a dog, coolly pocketing the money for a cat advertisement like this, and taking a class in the Sabbath school!—advocating the right of the people to establish slavery, and praying to Almighty God "to break every yoke, and let the oppressed go free!" What a beautiful commingling of deity and goodness—what blending of democracy and tyranny!

It gives us no pleasure to speak thus harshly. We would fain believe that the Democrat has not calmly considered and considerably weighed the consequences which are likely to result from the passage of this Nebraska Bill—has not glanced into the future and seen what is likely to follow from this unconditional admission of right to establish slavery, under the specious plea of non-intervention. We are believers in the doctrine of popular sovereignty, but in no interpretation of it which would give any people the right to contravene God's moral laws by the establishment of human servitude. The right of the people to regulate their own domestic affairs, is a quality

of one, one which must be exercised in harmony with God's laws, and then only it is "consonant to the spirit of republicanism." The carrying out of these principles of non-intervention, and leaving the people the right to establish slavery if they wish, the Democrat says will quiet the existing question of slavery. Futile hope! Pass the Nebraska Bill, and the sea of agitation will only become more purturbed. It will break down all the ancient land marks, and add new fuel to the fire. There will be no quiet where slavery is spreading itself over the fertile soil of Kansas and Nebraska.

The North, with the fragments of the broken compact gauding them on, will agitate for mastery and power between the North and South, between Slavery and Freedom, and will be more intense than ever before, and it is easy to see which in the end must triumph. Freedom is strong, Slavery is weak, the former may, and does often, submit to bearable restraints, but when aroused to action by multiplied wrongs, it cannot be overborne; the latter may flourish by toleration, but it has no inherent strength, and when its exactions are pressed to an unwonted length, their exactions only pave the way for its ultimate downfall. Pass this Nebraska Bill, and the very next Congress will be a theatre of a more deadly strife than ever before. Every application for admittance of States, formed out of this or any other territory, would be resisted, unless Slavery was prohibited, and the public sentiment of the free States, outraged by the destruction of the plighted faith, would demand and accomplish in the end, not only the restoration of their own rights, but even more, probably, the destruction of the system of slavery itself.

We have said that the Compromise of 1850 established no principles which had any application beyond the questions which they immediately settled, the Congressional non-intervention was limited to the territorial governments established. This is no partisan idea. Papers, whose claims to democracy rest upon as solid foundation as does the Democrat, agree with us, and we do but reiterate their arguments. In this State for instance, the Age, with a power and boldness which is creditable to its conductors, takes strong and manly ground against such an interpretation. It counsels the House of Representatives in an able article, published March 16, "to allow no fanciful theory of non-intervention, achieved by direct intervention, and involving bad national faith, to captivate its judgment—no specious pretext of establishing 'equal sovereignty' in the territories, in contempt of popular sovereignty in the States, to serve it from its duty," and says that the new interpretation of the Compromise of 1850, such as the Democrat says it "heartily concurs" in, is destined to encounter a spirit of opposition that will not down at the bidding of party presses, or party leaders. It is an interpretation against the honest sentiment of the people; and the expression of that sentiment cannot be stifled or controlled. It will find vent; and if not allowed to do so in legitimate remonstrance and protestation, the danger is, it will find it in a more exceptional mode.

The Age is right. "It will find vent" and the public mind and the public newspaper that stands in the way of its current will be hurried to swift destruction, and to damning infamy. The Age says, and there is manliness in the declaration:

"There are certain loads we can carry, and there are certain other loads we cannot carry; if we would; and this Nebraska load is one of them. The sentiment of the people is fixed and immovable on this question, beyond the power of the press—which is omnipotent when right, but impotent when wrong—to change or reverse it."

The Democrat has taken a load which it cannot carry. It may try, but it will stagger and reel like a drunken man, and like him at last fall into the ditch, and lying there become the scoff and sneer of the passers by.

In the preparation of this article, we have not busied ourselves to present any of those minor circumstances connected with the congressional history of the bill under consideration. The great fact that it abrogates the solemn compact of 1820 for the prohibition of Slavery north of 36° 30', and, as expressed by leading southern papers, gives the South, "what it did not possess before, a chance to colonize in the territory of Nebraska," and that it is supported by Southern men in Congress for this avowed object, overshadows every thing else. It is this great fact which stamps it with the seal of infamy, and which will brand with an enduring infamy the public man from the free States who gives it his support.

Mr. Spofford in his speech published in our last, relates the fact that during one of the terrible days of the first revolution in France, a Frenchman stood at the bar of the National Convention, and cried for the space of an hour, "I demand the arrest of knaves and dastards." Should a similar cry be raised at this time in the Capitol at Washington, would it not fall with startling significance on the public ear, and strike deep into the public mind? Would there be any occasion for asking whose arrest was demanded? The public heart which beats true to freedom, and is loyal to the spirit and letter of our institutions, would respond at once that the cry was for the arrest of the knaves who were endeavoring to purchase for themselves power and place by the sale of the public faith, and the denial of man's inalienable rights, and the crushing of a nation's birth-right under the iron heel of oppression, and of the dastards, who in obedience to party boasts, and in compliance with the mandate of power, were basely adding, in the spirit of dastardism, the knaves in the accomplishment of this gigantic wrong. The public finger would point at once at the contrivers and abettors of the Nebraska villainy; and say, these are the knaves and dastards whose arrest is demanded. In fact, such a cry as was raised by the poor Frenchman, is raised not only at Washington, but it reaches across the broad prairies of the West, and reverberates over the wide fields of the middle States, and through the busy

cities and towns of the northern Atlantic States. Wherever there is a just conception of man's rights, and a true regard for national prosperity, and a proper appreciation of duty to posterity, the cry is heard.

We counsel the Democrat to leave our representative in Congress to hear the warning voice, and not give further aid to those at Washington, who seek to shelter themselves from the indignation of a betrayed constituency, when they shall have performed their contemplated treason to freedom, and outraged the public rights.

BIDDEFORD TOWN MEETING.

At an adjourned meeting of the legal voters of the town of Biddeford, March 20, 1854, of which Jonathan Tuck was moderator, and Fred. D. Edgerly Town Clerk, on motion proceeded to business for the meeting.

Voted, To excuse Nehemiah Hill from seeking as street Commissioner.

Seth Gordon was chosen street Commissioner for the lower end of the town.

Voted, To raise six thousand dollars for the common expenses of the town the ensuing year.

Voted to raise the sum of five thousand dollars cash for highways.

Voted, To raise the sum of six thousand five hundred dollars for the support of schools, to be divided among the several school districts.

Voted, The sum of three hundred dollars for the benefit of the engine company, provided they keep it well organized; and a sum of money not exceeding one hundred and fifty dollars to enlarge the Engine house, to be under the direction of the Selectmen.

Voted, That the same method be adopted last year, to collect the taxes including the polls.

Voted, To erect 8 gas lights between the covered bridge and the Bakery of M. & H. Pierce, at the expense of the town at equal distances from each other.

Voted, That Geo. H. Adams, Cyrus Gordon, D. E. Somes, Samuel Gilpatrick, Stephen Everett, John T. Smith and Abel H. Jellison, serve as a board of Assessors.

FUSS IN THE SENATE.

SENATOR DOUGLAS made a great fuss, generally, when Mr. Everett presented the memorial of the 3000 Clergymen against the Nebraska Bill on the 14 inst. He said that the language of the memorial was disrespectful to the Senate, and pronounced the statements of the memorial "atrocious slanders." Mr. Everett explained his connection with the memorial, but it does not appear from the Telegraphic report that he replied to Mr. Douglas. Houston defended the memorial and the ministers. "He said he saw nothing infernal or monstrous in it; nothing that offered any indignity to the Senate. The memorialists charged that the Nebraska bill was a violation of the national faith. He had made the same charge in the debate, and had proved it. He then told the Senate that the passage of the bill would lead to excitement and agitation; it was then denied by Senators, but this memorial, signed by 3000 ministers of the Living God, was evidence that the people were deeply moved."

Mr. Seward also defended the memorialists at some length.

NEW HAMPSHIRE ELECTION.

We were altogether too much in a hurry in giving up, as we did last week, New Hampshire to the Administration. We have been so long in the habit of recording democratic victories in that State, that we supposed the forces of the Administration had carried the State, as a matter of course. We are glad to be able to take the back track, and if any of our contemporaries in New Hampshire think we ought to apologize, we will do so with all our heart. The Nebraska load, it seems, was too heavy for New Hampshire to carry, and her people, notwithstanding the immense force brought by the Administration to sustain itself, have administered a scorching rebuke to the President and her Senators in Congress.—Last year the Administration majority in the Legislature was 89, and Martin, democrat, was elected, by nearly 600 majority. This year Baker, who runs far ahead of his ticket, and is one of the most popular men in the State, is elected by perhaps 1500 majority, but the locofoco majority in the Legislature is annihilated, and an opposition House is elected.

The New Hampshire Statesman of Saturday, continues to claim 156 whig Representatives in the State, and gives the names of a large part of them. Its account is as follows:

County.	Whigs.	Democrats.
Rockingham,	27	15
Stratford,	15	12
Belknap,	8	10
Carroll,	6	10
Merrimack,	18	20
Hillsboro',	36	19
Cheshire,	18	9
Sullivan,	8	9
Grafton,	18	21
Cook,	2	4
Total.	156	133

The Concord Patriot, it will be remembered, claims 156 Democrats to 146 opposition. The discrepancy may be explained by the fact that some of the Free Soilers have been classed under their old designations—the Statesmen putting them down as "Whigs," and the Patriot putting down all those who formerly acted with the Democrats as Democrats.

The Boston Journal last evening says: "We have information from a reliable source, which leaves no doubt upon our mind, that there will be a majority against the democrats in the New Hampshire Legislature. A careful revision of the returns shows that the democrats have elected 143 members of the House, against 154 opposition, with 9 towns to be heard from. The Patriot figures up a small democratic majority by claiming some elected as Free Soilers, and it is probable that the claim will be persisted in until the Legislature meets. It is not surprising, that the administration party should endeavor to put the best face upon the result of the New Hampshire election. A rebuke so effective has seldom before been administered, and the only consolation the administration party can have is, that by their artful, though only partially successful, efforts to keep the Nebraska issue out of the contest, they have just saved themselves from an utter rout."

THE INTENTION.

The agitators of the Nebraska project hope to get up an excitement out of the recent seizure of the Black Warrior, by the authorities of Havana, and thus withdraw the attention of the people from the seizure of all the unoccupied free territory in the country, by the slave power. But they will be disappointed. The north will protect itself from injustice at home, as well as insult abroad. It will stand firm in opposition to iniquity perpetrated at Washington, as well as wrong done at Havana, and it will not be diverted from its settled purpose by any new question thrown out to blind the people and drive them off from the scent of their traitor representatives.

REMOVAL OF THE COURTS.

A very spirited meeting of the citizens of Saco and Biddeford, friendly to the removal of the Courts was held on Monday evening, at Beethoven Hall. The position of the question at Augusta was stated by the gentlemen who went to Augusta to attend to the matter before the Legislature, and a strong determination expressed to continue efforts for the removal, until the question was submitted to the people. The meeting was a full one, Dr. Horace Bacon, Chairman, E. H. Burdham, Secretary. A large delegation went on Wednesday from both places to advocate the justness of the measure to the members of the Legislature. The subject was under consideration in the House yesterday, and a motion to reconsider the vote of the House, accepting the report of the Committee giving the petitioners leave to withdraw. We have not heard what disposition was made of it.

The prohibitory liquor law has passed the Assembly of Wisconsin by a vote of 43 to 28.

A Southern Whig estimates that five-sevenths of the whole white population of the South are non-slaveholders.

Capt. John M. Ames, West Parsonsfield, sold a yoke of oxen, four years old last spring, for \$200. Live weight, 4000 lbs. Girth 7 feet 4 inches.

Job Printing in all its multitudinous forms, executed at this office in the best style of the art, with the utmost dispatch, and at prices which will prove satisfactory to all who may favor us with their orders.

Mr. A. Gilpatrick has opened a new Writing Academy at No. 9 Central Block.—Mr. G. ranks A. No. 1 in his profession, and he justly deserves the liberal patronage which he receives.

Please notice the advertisement of a new Clothing and Furnishing Store, inserted in our columns to-day. The old friends of C. W. Boothby will not be slow in availing themselves of his services again in making and fitting garments to adorn the outward man, and his stock of furnishing goods will be found a most excellent one to make selections from.

The Detroit A.vertiser claims the late election of Mayor in that city as an Anti-Nebraska triumph. Just before the election, the Democratic candidate announced himself as in favor of Douglas' Bill, while the Whig candidate was known to be opposed to it. The Whig was successful in a Democratic city by about 1000 majority.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, if you wish to see something new, and at the same time worthy of your support, just step into the rooms over Rollins & Co's Clothing Store, in Washington Block. Don't fail to call.—The rooms will be opened for the reception of customers, for the first time, on Monday next.

In a recent case at Lawrence, where a teacher was sued for injuring a boy under her charge, by correction, the great principle of law was conceded by both parties, that for school purposes the teacher is possessed of all the authority of the parent, and is not liable for any punishment of a pupil unless it be such a punishment as would be unlawful if inflicted by a parent. Verdict for defendant.

The Panorama of the Antediluvian World and Palestine, which we had the pleasure of seeing this week at Central Hall, is a most magnificent painting. The work is executed in the highest style of art, and we never witnessed a more perfect specimen of human ingenuity. The explanations of the scenes were very instructive, which gave a double interest to the exhibition.

The almost unanimous protest of the clergy of the North against the Nebraska bill naturally produces a great effect. The Journal of Commerce copied sermons in favor of the compromise measures and of the enforcement of the fugitive slave law. That paper awarded great praise to the clergy for these sermons. Now it looks with disgust upon the practice of ministers "dabbling with politics."

Some of the newspaper writers of the day, in speaking of the present war in Europe, express the belief that it will, instead of an evil, prove a blessing,—for, say they, it will be the means of many souls being converted to the true faith.—These sentiments appear to us as being rather unchristian-like ones. If the cause of religion cannot be advanced by any other creed than that of war, it would, we think, be quite as well to let the cause remain where it is.

We see the following quoted as taken from the Washington Union: "We have every assurance that within the range of his authority, President Pierce will employ all the influence of his Administration to insure the passage of the Nebraska bill, and if it be submitted to him for executive approval, that he will promptly and exultingly impart to it the sanctity and obligation of law. ON HIM WILL REST THE WHOLE RESPONSIBILITY.—TO HIM BELONGS ALL THE GLORY."

Not bad. In the New York Independent we find the following from a mother:

"I was showing my little boy the picture of the martyrs thrown to the lions, and was talking very solemnly to him, trying to make him feel what a terrible thing it was, 'Ma,' said he, all at once, 'Oh, ma! just look at that poor little lion war behind there; he won't get any!'"

A gentleman, residing in a neighboring town, with whom we have a slight acquaintance, sends us the appended communication, with a request to publish the same. The writer is a Democrat, and we suppose from the heading of the article that it was prepared in the first instance for the columns of the Democrat.

For the Maine Democrat.

FRIEND HANCOCK: It is seldom that I enter into a newspaper controversy, and still more seldom that I take up my pen to oppose an opinion advanced by a friend so esteemed as yourself; but since you have so boldly broken the long, and to me mysterious silence, respecting that bill of abominations, the Douglas fire-brand, my bold New England spirit and untrammelled pen could no longer be restrained. And had you been like myself an humble individual, I should hardly have ventured to obtrude my views upon your notice; but as you occupy a more elevated position, and are considered our leader in all that pertains to the principles of Democracy in this country, a sense of duty to myself and to the great Democratic party impels me to protest in the name of God and our common country against the repeal of that act of 1820, which prohibits the accursed system of slavery from extending itself into the "free" States. Although I have fully believed in freedom and slavery; still in common with many other true Democrats I have silently acquiesced in that measure for the sake of stilling the agitation on this troublesome question. I always supposed, as you did, that henceforth, the renewal of the slavery agitation would be necessarily confined to the ranks of the abolitionists, and that opposition was strong enough to prevent the fact that both political parties declared the finality of the question. Again, when I read the Baltimore platform and the admirable message of President Pierce, I am fully satisfied, and so are you, that this measure was not to be disturbed by the party now in power. Now I wish you to consider well the position you have taken in this matter, and if you advise the Democracy of Me., and especially of York County, about the merits of the subject, and the party become broken up by adopting your views, you would be held responsible. You may depend that as for me I entirely repudiate your course and will hold both Douglas and his abettors to a strict account for all the evils which will inevitably result from such a suicidal course. The agitation heretofore carried on by the abolitionists, will be considered of no account when compared to this commenced by the Democratic party under the leadership of Douglas, aided by a portion of the Democratic press. I have long been a constant reader, and an ardent subscriber of your paper; but much as I love the party I freely confess I love consistency far better, and hence my repugnance to the measure about to be consummated by our representatives in the halls of Congress. The New England, as well as the great Northern democratic people are by no means dead nor asleep, although a little torpid; but soon that torpidity will be thrown off, and we betide the individual or party upon whom the righteous tide of indignation shall be poured.

AN OLD DEMOCRAT.

The President on the Black Warrior Affair.

In the House of Representatives of Wednesday, the following proceedings took place. The moderate tone of the President's Message is a matter of congratulation. Mr. Walbridge (N. Y.) said he understood an important communication suggesting the immediate action of Congress, had been received, and was now on the table, from the President of the United States in reference to the resolution of the House with reference to the recent outrages on our commerce by the Spanish authorities in Cuba, and he therefore moved that the Committee rise, that the communication might be read.

Mr. Stanton (Tenn.)—Let's have it.

The Committee rose, and the Speaker laid before the House the following message:

To the House of Representatives: In compliance with the resolution of the House of Representatives of the 10th inst., I herewith transmit a report of the Secretary of State containing all the information received at the Department, in relation to the seizure of the Black Warrior at Havana on the 28th ult. There have been, in the course of a few years past, many other instances of aggression upon our commerce, and violations of the rights of American citizens, and insults to the national flag by the Spanish authorities in Cuba; and all attempts to obtain redress have been protracted by faithless negotiations. The documents in these cases have been voluminous, and when prepared, will be sent to Congress.—Those now transmitted relate exclusively to the seizure of the Black Warrior, and present so clear a case of wrong, that it would be needless to expect full indemnity therefore as soon as this unjustifiable and offensive conduct shall be made known to her Catholic Majesty's Government; but similar expectations in other cases have not been realized. The offending party is at our doors with large powers for aggression, but none, it is alleged, for reparation. The source of redress is in another hemisphere, and the answers to our just complaints made to the home Government are but the repetition of excuses rendered by inferior officials to their superiors in reply to representations of misconduct. The peculiar situation of the parties has unfortunately much aggravated the annoyances and injuries which our citizens have suffered from Cuban authorities. In giving very extraordinary powers to them she owes it to justice and to her friendly relations with this Government, to guard with great vigilance the observance of our just rights, to obtain redress for injuries received, and to vindicate the honor of our flag. In anticipation of that contingency, which I earnestly hope may not arise, I suggest to Congress the propriety of adopting such provisional measures as the exigency of the case may seem to demand.

(Signed) FRANKLIN PIERCE, President.

WASHINGTON, March 15, 1854.

The last of papers accompanying the report of the Secretary of State to the President, include the letters of Mr. Robertson, Acting United States Consul at Havana, to Mr. Marcy, under dates of March 31 and 7th; with the protest of the consigned and master of the Black Warrior, and the letter of Livingston, Cochran & Co. to Mr. Marcy, March 11th; letter of Mr. Sullivan to Mr. Marcy, with accompanying, March 13th.

Mr. Bayly (Va.)—I move the message be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and printed. I beg to say that my admiration is excited by the character of the message. Motion agreed to.

We take the following items from the Washington correspondence of the New York Tribune:

Some women of Alliance, Stark County, Ohio, have ingeniously sewed thirty three-cent pieces between two sheets of gauze, forming a transparent mat of three or four inches square, and have sent them to Senator Douglas, with the following letter.—The letter is signed by something over one hundred names.

To Mr. Douglas, of Illinois, Member of the United States Senate:

Sir—We, the undersigned, wives, mothers and daughters of Stark County, Ohio, feeling grateful that our country is the "Land of the Free and Home of the Brave," is so free that white husbands, sons and brothers, can be the owners of slaves, beg to present to you the enclosed "thirty pieces of silver" as a testimony of the sentiments we entertain for your labors in the Nebraska Bill.—If Judas was worthy of his reward for betraying one whom he knew had the power to extricate himself from the hands of his crucifiers, then much more are you worthy of this reward, (should no office of emolument be proffered you), for this betrayal of liberty; for this effort to cast into hands more brutal than Jewish crucifiers, those bonds of unfeeling, weak and hapless fathers and mothers, husbands and wives, sons and daughters, accused of no infraction of religious or civil law, and whose blood is called for by no maddening populace, but by cold-blooded avarice and the foulest passions.

Without dwelling upon this horrid picture further, may you receive the "thirty pieces of silver" herewith, as an evidence of the consideration in which we hold you, and you follow the last act of Judas, may you repent in deepest sackcloth this most nefarious betrayal of Liberty!

Nominations by the Governor.

TUESDAY, March 21
Daniel T. Granger, Eastport, Justice of Supreme Judicial Court, vice Judge Wells, resigned.
John H. Morrill, Lincoln, Agent for Penobscot Indians.
Joseph T. Nye, Saco, Judge of Probate, York County.
Ebenezer Wells, Freeport, County Commissioner, Cumberland County.
John H. Williams, Judge Municipal Court, Portland.
Thomas S. Pullen, Dover, Sheriff, Piscataquis County.
Leonard Robinson, Foxcroft, County Commissioner, Piscataquis County.
ANDROSCOGGIN COUNTY.
Nahum Morrill, Auburn, Judge of Probate.
Sietson L. Hill, Webster, Register of Probate.
Charles Clark, Danville, Clerk.
Cyrus Knapp, E. Livermore, Sheriff.
Chas. W. Goddard, Danville, County Attorney.
John H. Otis, Leeds, Register of Deeds.
Reuel Washburn, Livermore, County Stephen H. Reed, Lewiston, Comm. Samuel Moody, Lisbon, Comm. James Goff, Jr., Auburn, Co. Treasurer.

BURNING OF THE Steamboat Caroline.

FROM THE ST. LOUIS REPUBLICAN, March 13th.
Mr. C. C. DeWitt, first engineer of the new steamer Caroline, arrived at this city yesterday, and from him we learn the first particulars of the total destruction of the steamer Caroline by fire, and the loss of the lives of fifty or sixty passengers.

EWBANK, Com. of Patents,"
18, 1853. 1724